

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-10, 13-33, 36-56, and 59-72 are pending. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 10, 13-23, 24, 36, 47, 59, and 70 have been amended. Claims 11-12, 34-35, and 57-58 have been Canceled. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found in the canceled claims, which were originally filed with the application, at paragraphs 101 and 102 as originally filed in the specification.

Claims 1-23, 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. To overcome the § 101 rejection each of claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 10, 13-23, 36, 59, and 70 have been amended to recite a specific machine configured to carry out the method steps.

Claims 1-3, 10-13, 16, 18-26, 33-36, 39, 41-49, 56-59, 62, 64-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajasekharan et al. U.S. Publ. No. 20030024975, in further view of Rothschild et al. U.S. Patent No. 6766363.

Claims 14, 15, 17, 37-38, 40-60-61, and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajasekharan et al. U.S. Publ. No. 20030024975, in further view of Rothschild et al. U.S. Patent No. 6766363, in further view of Witz et al. U.S. Patent No. 6152369.

Claims 4-9, 27-32, 50-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajasekharan in view of Rothschild as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of Jun et al. U.S. Patent No.6931594.

Claims 1, 24, and 47 have each been amended to overcome the rejection over Rajasekharan in view of Rothschild. The following comments are directed toward amended claim 1 but equally apply to amended claims 24 and 47 as each of claims 24 and 47 have been amended to recite similar limitations as those limitations of claim 1 discussed below. Claim 1 is generally directed to a method for determining a specific portion of multimedia information (such as a video and audio as recited in claim 3) and outputting the specific portion of the multimedia information so that a user may consume that portion (e.g., watch the portion of the video). To aid users in their selection of the specific portion, a paper document is provided to a

user where the paper document include identifiers (such as barcode identifiers as recited in claim 10) for a plurality of consecutive portions of the recorded information. The paper document serves as an index for the recorded information so that the user may quickly determine and select a portion of the multimedia information the user would like to consume. According to amended claim 1, a computer receives a selected identifier for a portion of the recorded information where the identifier is printed on the paper document. The computer then determines a time range for the portion of the multimedia information and determines a start time and a stop time for the portion. Secondary information is received by the computer for an operation for how the portion of the multimedia information is to output by the computer.

Rajasekharan, as understood, discusses a system for forming a conglomeration or aggregation of data of various types, which are referred to as a tour. The various pieces of data in a tour may include video, web pages, audio tracks, photographs, passages of text, etc. Rajasekharan describes that a tour is a logical collection of data, for example, about a subject. A tour might include disparate pieces of data about art pieces displayed in a museum, or a mother speaking various words about objects in her house so that a baby might learn the words for the objects, etc. Each piece of data in a tour may be associated with one or more labels for later identification of the pieces of data. The labels might include barcodes, RF or IR identifiers, text, GPS coordinates, or time stamps from an internal clock. For example, a time stamp may be used to identify a piece of data in a tour, such as a video being recorded at a given time of day. The time stamp does not temporally identify the location of the piece of data within the tour. That is, the time stamp is not associated with a time range for the temporal position of a portion of recorded information.

It is specifically known that the time stamp of Rajasekharan does not temporally identify a time range for the data identified by the time stamp because each label used to identify a piece of data is “normalized” to common “label normalization” value. That is, if an RF identifier and a time stamp identifier identify the same piece of data in a tour, the RF identifier and the time stamp identifier are normalized to a common value that is then used to identify the data in the tour. It is well known by those of skill in the art that the normalized label does not

carry any of the time stamp information because the time stamp information is lost in the normalization process. See Rajasekharan at paragraphs 71-73 and Fig. 5A.

Further, Rajasekharan does not discuss that a portion of the recorded information is output from the computer after the portion of the recorded information is determined to be correspond to the time range. That is, no date in a tour is output from a computer based on a time range because the labels that are used to identify data in a tour are normalized to a common value.

Rothschild does not make up for this deficiency of Rajasekharan. Rothschild, as understood, discusses a method for linking a first set of data to a second set of data so that a user may be provided further detailed information about the second set of data. The first set of data may be predetermined and may include UPC codes, titles, timing information, etc. The second set of data may include a URL that is a link to information. Rothschild provides a few specific examples that aid in the understanding of Rothschild's systems and methods. For example, Rothschild discusses that the second set of data may be a URL or the like that links to information for a car displayed in the movie. The car may be displayed at a select time in the movie. The user might enter information into a mobile electronic device for the movie title and the approximate time that the car is displayed in the movie. A server computer receiving the movie title and the time determines whether a second sets of data exists for anything in the movie at the given time. If a second set of data exists for the movie and the time, the server computer sends the second set of data to the user's mobile electronic device. As discussed above, the second set of data may include a URL that links to information for the car shown in the movie. While Rothschild discusses the use of time information for a movie, the time information is not used to determine a time range for a portion of the movie so that the portion of the movie may be output by a computer for use by a user. Therefore, Rothschild fails similarly to Rajasekharan to show or suggest every limitation of amended claim 1. Therefore, Rajasekharan in view of Rothschild fails to render amended claim 1 obvious.

Independent claims 24 and 47 have been amended to recite substantially similar limitations to those limitations of amended claim 1 distinguished from Rajasekharan and Rothschild above. Therefore, for at least the same reasons that Rajasekharan and Rothschild fail to render amended claim 1 obvious, Rajasekharan and Rothschild similar fail to render each of amended claims 24 and 27 obvious.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/Rodney C. LeRoy/

Rodney C. LeRoy
Reg. No. 53,205

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
RCL:jis
62090628 v1